

and a drawn out style. He does not force conviction in swift, strong flashes. It is not graphic, and never goes direct to the root of a matter. But he is not tedious. The beautiful voice saves him from that. It makes the tender patient follow him through the mazes of argument, deduction and logic. His arrangement of arguments is cumulative.

The presiding judge rubbed him often against the grain and often begged him to stop. He refused to speak so much about his own confusions, but to keep to the Dreyfus affair. Picquart respectfully accepted these reproaches, saying that he only spoke of his own concerns in order to vindicate his character and to prove himself a credible witness. He spent two hours yesterday and five hours to-day in giving evidence, and remains the guardian angel of the Dreyfus family, standing between him and the implacable enemies who sit on the front seat of the witnesses. In this row are Generals Mercier and Roget, and many field officers who are still un-Roguet, and many field officers who are still un-Roguet, and many field officers who are still un-Roguet.

BILLOT UNDISTURBED.

General Billot, however, did not, apparently, share in their ferocious feelings. He seemed untroubled by Picquart's statements. Billot was on the staff of Bazaine in Mexico, and is also from Metz. He is a born politician, and is always guided by the instinct of self-preservation. He is not a bad man. He took from Metz in 1870 a commission as colonel, and Bazaine had signed, showed it to Gambetta and then promoted him a peg higher. He is a type of the old, retired sergeant one might see playing cards in a provincial cafe, with a pipe and a glass of absinthe. Those who do not know his history are amazed to think he was twice a Minister of War and is a life Senator. The Dreyfusites greatly fear for Picquart's life. The stalwarts among them now guard him. He looks a man with an unpropitious star, and he has always been unlucky, unless in having that peace of soul that passeth understanding.

THE PROCEEDINGS IN DETAIL.

PIQUART'S TESTIMONY OCCUPIES THE ENTIRE SESSION—CONFRONTED BY MERCIER AND ROGET AT THE END.

Rennes, Aug. 18.—The trial by court martial of Captain Dreyfus was resumed at 7:25 o'clock this morning without incident. Colonel Picquart continuing his testimony. He spoke in the same loud, fearless tone, and began by declaring that he thought it necessary to inform General Roget's arraignment of him. General Zurlinden, General Billot, General Roget and General Mercier were present.

Colonel Picquart proceeded to discuss the secret dossier as the mainpring of the condemnation of Dreyfus. He took up the consideration of the documents, successively referring to the writers and persons addressed as "A" and "B," occasionally treating of the "Cette canaille de D—" document.

SPOKE FOR FIVE HOURS.

Colonel Picquart practically occupied the whole of to-day's sitting with a masterful presentation of his side of the case. He spoke for five hours, and his voice at the end of that time began to show signs of fatigue. His testimony was followed with the closest attention by the members of the court martial and by the audience. During the brief suspension of the court Generals Mercier, Roget, Billot and De Boisdeffre and other witnesses sauntered together up and down the courtyard of the Lycée or gathered in little groups, animatedly discussing Picquart's evidence, which, although it contained but few new facts, was so cleverly pieced before the tribunal and was spoken so effectively that it could not fail to repeat the impression he made yesterday. He spoke without notes, and, in view of the mass of facts adduced, it must be ranked as a feat of memory.

Dreyfus drank in all the witness's words, which came as a balmy breeze to the wounds inflicted upon him by Roget and Roget, and the prisoner frequently and closely scanned the faces of his judges, as though seeking to read their thoughts.

The members of the court martial took copious notes during Picquart's testimony, and it was quite evident that several of the explanations he gave came as fresh light.

When Picquart concluded, both General Roget and General Mercier jumped up and asked to be heard in contradiction. Colonel Jonaust asked General Roget to speak first. He thereupon faced Colonel Picquart, who replied promptly to his questions, which the General delivered in a theatrical manner and with frequent gestures. General Mercier adopted a quieter demeanor. Neither, however, said anything which could be described as damaging to Colonel Picquart's evidence.

After Picquart had reiterated his statements the court adjourned, at 11:40 a. m., until tomorrow. The deposition of Colonel Picquart occupied the entire session.

From the point of view of the spectators, the session was the most monotonous one since the opening of the trial. Even the confrontation at the end lacked the dramatic force of the similar incidents which have marked almost every previous sitting.

THE TESTIMONY.

Following is to-day's testimony in detail: Before resuming his deposition, Colonel Picquart said: "I think it necessary to say a few words with reference to the veritable speech for the prosecution delivered by General Roget when referring to the Quenell case."

The president of the court, Colonel Jonaust, here interposed, saying, "Is it a personal matter?"

"I shall be very brief, Colonel," replied Picquart. "I am, moreover, ready to reply to all questions the Court may ask on the subject. For the moment, I shall confine myself to the following explanation:

"The Quenell case occurred between May 30

"Some women at the critical period of approaching motherhood fortunately receive every care and attention which abundant means can bestow, but the vast majority of them are obliged to take care of themselves and do their own work into the bargain; and what a woman with family duties dependent upon her can be expected to patiently endure the long-drawn-out weariness of waiting and hoping in the wretchedness for a recovery that seems to come on leaden wings!"

"My wife has been a great sufferer from troubles incident to approaching motherhood," says Rev. R. Nelson, of Darville, New Jersey. "She suffered with such distress that she could not take food; what little was forced down could not be retained. Her breath was very offensive and indicated a bad state of the stomach. The digestive organs refused to work. The trouble became so severe and obstinate that I was really alarmed. She began taking Dr. Pierce's Favorite Purgative, and about the same time I wrote to Dr. Pierce for particular advice. He promptly answered me, and I followed his directions with the result that she was cured and is now a healthy woman."

"By the time the letter was received she was improving fast and before all of one bottle each of the Favorite Purgative and Golden Medical Discovery had been taken she was up, able to eat, retain and digest her food. She continued to improve until entirely cured. With the taking of the cure of invalid women. They will not create craving for stimulants."

"Accept no substitutes for these world-famous medicines, that may be used under any circumstances, but that the dealer may make a little extra profit. These remedies contain no trace of alcohol, nor opium, nor any of the dangerous drugs which are so largely used in many advertised 'compounds.' They are recommended for the cure of invalid women. They will not create craving for stimulants."

If the bowels are irregular they can be regulated perfectly by Dr. Pierce's Pleasant Pellets.

and July 17, 1896, at which period, on account of a family bereavement, I was able to pay very little attention to my official duties. In my absence, Colonel Henry acted for me. Moreover, I devoted most of the month of July to a journey of the headquarters staff, which also prevented me from attending to my ordinary duties. I was, therefore, able to give only very intermittent attention to the Quenell case. Besides this, Quenell was a returned convict who had contravened a decree of expulsion, and had been caught red handed in another criminal act. He was, at first sight a not particularly interesting personage."

At this point General Roget said, "I wish to be allowed to reply."

"You shall," said Colonel Jonaust.

Colonel Picquart, continuing, said: "I protest absolutely against the allegation that I consented to the communication of secret documents to the members of the Dreyfus court martial without the prisoner's knowledge. I never ordered such communication, and if it was done it was not with my cognizance. I hasten to add that in my opinion it would have been an insult to the Court to believe that its members would lend themselves to such machinations."

"I am ready, I repeat, to reply to every question. I will only point out that all General Roget has recounted in detail was published in general terms in the 'Gaulois' on January 7. Having thus explained certain matters, I will continue my deposition."

THE SECRET DOSSIER.

Then the Colonel proceeded to discuss the phrase, occurring in the dossier, "I am going to the manoeuvres." He said there was no question of probationers going to the manoeuvres in September. This, he pointed out, would have curtailed their period of probation in an entirely unusual manner.

After dealing with the testimony of the experts at the court martial of 1894, Picquart proceeded to examine the secret dossier, a close analysis of which, he asserted, was particularly necessary, "owing to the weight the document had with the members of the court martial in 1894."

"This dossier," continued the witness, "may be divided into two parts. The first contains three documents—(1) A document known as the D'Avignon document, the terms of which are as follows: 'Doubt the proofs; service about letters; situation dangerous for me with French officer; no information from an officer of the line; important only as coming from the Ministry; already somewhere else'; (2) the document containing the words 'Cette canaille de D—'; (3) a document which is nothing but the report of a journey to Switzerland made in behalf of a foreign Power."

"The second part of the dossier," continued Picquart, "consisted partly of a supplementary review of the first. It contained the gist of seven or eight documents, one of which, 'Cette canaille de D—,' will serve for the purposes of comparison. It also contained the correspondence of attachés 'A' and 'B.'"

These initials, it should be borne in mind, represent Colonel Schwartzkoppen, formerly German Military Attaché at Paris, and Major Panizzardi, the former Military Attaché of Italy at the French capital.

At this juncture the Colonel said it would facilitate his explanations if he were permitted to see the secret dossier, adding: "I have already had it in my hands, but I fear my memory may fail me on some points."

"What you ask," replied the president of the court martial, "is impossible. The Ministers' orders are absolute. The secret dossier can only be examined under certain conditions."

"I regret it," answered Picquart. "But I will try to refresh my memory."

APPLIED TO ESTERHAZY ALSO.

The witness next explained why Major Du Paty de Clam's translation of the D'Avignon document was open to doubt, and why the document, if it had any meaning whatever, was as applicable to Esterhazy as to Dreyfus.

Regarding the correspondence of the military attachés, the witness demonstrated the insignificance of the information asked for. While Du Paty de Clam regarded the correspondence as convincing, and as clearly indicating an officer of the Second Bureau, Picquart maintained that the terms of the correspondence indicated that the writer intended to ask a friend, and not a spy, for the information desired. Many headquarters officers, he pointed out, were on cordial and absolutely legitimate terms with the foreign military attachés.

Colonel Picquart then took up the "Cette canaille de D—" document. He called the attention of the court to the fact that it was addressed by Schwartzkoppen to Panizzardi, and not vice versa, as long believed. After giving his reasons for believing that Dreyfus was not the person referred to in that document, Picquart showed how Du Paty de Clam endeavored to ascribe the authorship of the document to Panizzardi, with the view of establishing a connection, which, in reality, did not exist, between the various documents in the indictment against Dreyfus.

The document referring to the French agents' journey to Switzerland, of which Schwartzkoppen is said to have been informed, was only slightly commented upon by the witness, as he did not attach importance to it.

The minute detail with which the Colonel dealt with the evidence, the clearness of his language, and his deductions had great effect upon the audience, and elicited general admiration. He concluded his examination of the first portion of the secret dossier by saying:

"May I be allowed to express deep regret at the absence of Major du Paty de Clam? It seems to me indispensable that this officer, who wrote the commentaries on the secret dossier, should be summoned to give evidence here. He would give us his reminiscences, and I would help him." (Laughter.)

STOLEN FROM PIQUART'S DESK.

"But," added Colonel Picquart, "since I am dealing with this question of the commentaries of Major du Paty de Clam, permit me to point out to you, gentlemen, that this document was not the property of any particular Minister. It was classified as belonging to the Intelligence Department, and, as you see, it formed part of a well defined dossier—a dossier which was shut up in one of the drawers of my desk, and which was abstracted from it. This commentary, therefore, is upon a secret dossier document which was improperly removed from my department." This statement created a stir in the courtroom.

"Mention was made yesterday," continued the witness, "of the disappearance of documents. That is the case in point."

Turning to the second portion of the dossier Picquart described a number of documents in it as forgeries, and said that the police reports therein contained nothing serious against Dreyfus. He explained that they embodied the theme mostly utilized by police spies in order to dupe the Intelligence Department, and asserted that their information was mostly worthless, embroidered or false, and prepared in order to make interesting reading.

"In the inquiry made by M. Quesnay de Beaupre, the ex-president of the Civil Section of the Court of Cassation," continued Colonel Picquart, "you have an excellent example of the sort of people who can present in the most specious guise what amounts absolutely to nothing. You cannot imagine, gentlemen, what people, in order to get money, if only a modest 20-franc piece, have brought to the Intelligence Department in the shape of so-called 'information,' which examination has proved to be worthless."

Dreyfus displayed the keenest interest in Picquart's protracted analysis of the dossier, which the whole audience listened to with profound at-

tention. The members of the court martial and the former Ministers of War were equally interested.

Of the latter, Generals Billot and Zurlinden were in full uniform. General Mercier was attired in civilian clothes. Next to him sat M. Bertillon, the examining magistrate, who gave such strong testimony for Dreyfus yesterday. Mme. Henry, widow of Lieutenant Colonel Henry, who yesterday taxed M. Bertillon with being a Judas, was not present.

SUSPICIONS AGAINST ESTERHAZY.

Concluding his examination of the secret dossier, Colonel Picquart explained how he had acquired the conviction that the dossier was written by Esterhazy, and how he ascertained that the anti-Dreyfus proofs were worthless. He began by detailing how he first learned of the existence of Esterhazy, and his efforts to discover something about him. He earnestly asserted that the first occasion on which he saw Esterhazy's name was when he read the address of the petit bleu. He said he was not acquainted with Esterhazy, and never had Esterhazy watched. Previous to this the utmost efforts had been made to prove the contrary and to show that Picquart knew Esterhazy before the discovery of the petit bleu. The Colonel emphasized this point, with the view, as explained, of showing how certain newspapers had misrepresented the facts, and he created a mild stir by adding: "I shall have occasion to point out other and similar examples."

The witness then rebuted the charges against him of unnecessarily delaying the prosecution of Esterhazy. He said that his object was to avoid arousing suspicion in regard to an officer who, perhaps, was entirely innocent. "What a mistake," he added, "would have been averted in 1894 had they acted in the same way in regard to Dreyfus." This remark caused murmurs of approval in court.

What the witness gathered about Esterhazy's character, he continued, created the worst impression upon him, but he learned nothing to connect Esterhazy with any act of espionage. Therefore he did not mention his suspicions. An officer, however, was ordered to watch Esterhazy, who had completely compromised himself through his relations with an English company of which he had agreed to become a director.

"That could not be permitted in the case of a French officer," said Picquart. "Moreover, Esterhazy gambled, led a life of debauchery, and lived with Mme. Pays."

THE BASLE INCIDENT.

Turning to the leakage at headquarters, the witness described the negotiations of Major Lauth with the spy, Richard Cuers, at Basle, showing how the spy promised information about the leakage and how he (Picquart) was induced to permit Lieutenant Colonel Henry to accompany Major Lauth to Basle.

Colonel Picquart also described the vague replies of Lieutenant Colonel Henry when questioned on the subject of Esterhazy before his departure, and the fulfillment of his visit to Basle because of Cuers's refusal, when he saw Henry, to impart the promised information. This incident caused the witness to wonder whether, instead of trying to make Cuers speak, Henry and Lauth had not done everything possible to impose silence upon him.

Before the Basle incident Colonel Picquart had decided to speak to General de Boisdeffre about Esterhazy. "In answer to my request," said the witness, "General de Boisdeffre wrote me asking me to meet him at the train on his arrival from Vichy. While driving from the railroad station to the General's hotel I told him all I had done in regard to Esterhazy. I affirm that General de Boisdeffre knew that this question was to remain secret between us, and that I was not to mention it except to the Minister of War. I knew Esterhazy was anxious to enter the War Office, and I did not regard his desire favorably. I communicated my impressions to my chiefs, who approved all my steps, and the application of Esterhazy was rejected."

"His insistence, however, only increased my uneasiness regarding him, and I resolved to obtain a specimen of his handwriting. I was immediately struck with the similarity of his handwriting and that of the dossier, and forthwith I had the letters of Esterhazy which were in my possession photographed, and showed the photographs to Major du Paty de Clam and M. Bertillon (the handwriting expert), between August 25 and September 5."

The Colonel emphasized this point, because M. Bertillon affirms that he saw the photographs in May, 1896, and he made a note of them, whereas the letters were not written on that date.

The conflicting testimony of Picquart and Bertillon on this point had been used to discredit the former's evidence.

Colonel Picquart, continuing, said that Du Paty de Clam, on seeing the writing, forthwith declared that it was that of Matthieu Dreyfus, the brother of Captain Dreyfus.

M. du Paty de Clam maintained, said Colonel Picquart, that the dossier was the joint work of Alfred and Matthieu Dreyfus. M. Bertillon also said: "That is the writing of the dossier."

DRAWING IN MATTHIEU DREYFUS.

"M. Bertillon then suggested that it was a tracing, and ended by saying that if it was current handwriting it could only have emanated from some one whom the Jews had been exercising for a year in imitating the writing of the dossier."

"At M. Bertillon's request I left the photographs with him. When he returned then he said he adhered to his opinion, and earnestly asked to see the original. When I saw beyond a doubt that the handwriting on the dossier was Esterhazy's, and, seeing that the documents mentioned therein might have been supplied by Esterhazy, that the words 'I am going to the manoeuvres' could perfectly well apply to Esterhazy, and that Esterhazy had secretaries at his disposal to copy a document so voluminous as the Firing Manual, I resolved to consult the secret dossier, to see what part of the treachery might be ascribed to Dreyfus, and to assure myself whether the dossier contained anything indicating Esterhazy."

"I frankly admit that I was stupefied on reading the secret dossier. I expected to find matters of gravity therein, and found, in short, nothing but a document which might apply just as much to Esterhazy as to Dreyfus, an unimportant document mentioning D'Avignon, and a document which it seemed absurd to apply to Dreyfus, namely, the 'Cette canaille de D—' document. Lastly, I recognized a report appended in the handwriting of Guenée, which appeared to be at least as worthless as the second document."

"It was then evening. I had stayed late alone at the office, in order to examine the documents thoroughly. I thought it over during the night, and the next day I explained the whole situation to General de Boisdeffre. I took to his office the secret dossier, the facsimile of the dossier, the petit bleu, and the principal papers connected with my investigation of Esterhazy."

SENT TO SEE GENERAL GONSE.

"I wonder, now, if I had one or two interviews. But I still see General de Boisdeffre, as he examined the secret dossier with me, step by step, he reached the end and told me to go into the country, give an account of the affair to General Gonse, and ask his advice."

"Before starting to see General Gonse, I copied a note, four pages in length, which I made on September 1, containing my résumé of the Esterhazy affair. When I informed General

Gonse of all which had occurred, he remarked, 'So a mistake has been made?'

"After my interview with General Gonse I did not work any longer on my own initiative. I said nothing more until the return of General Gonse on September 15. At that time Esterhazy was at the great manoeuvres."

Next, the witness dwelt on the rumors in September, 1896, of the project of replacing Dreyfus by a man of straw, and the discovery of the forged Weyler letter, supposed to be connected with the same project. At about the same time the campaign for and against Dreyfus was started by the newspapers.

At this stage of his deposition, Colonel Picquart, who had been speaking for two and a half hours, was visibly distressed. He had occasional attacks of coughing, but managed to continue, Colonel Jonaust not showing any inclination to suspend the session of the court in order to give him needed rest.

The witness then turned to the newspaper attacks on Dreyfus, saying that the information regarding the dossier contained in them convinced him that they had been inspired by some one closely connected with the Dreyfus affair. They could not, he added, be attributed to the Dreyfus family, while they claimed expressions familiar to Du Paty de Clam, whom it would be interesting to hear on the subject.

The witness next said that he asked permission to inquire into the sources of the articles, but was forbidden to interfere in any way whatever. Describing his interview with General Gonse on September 15, Colonel Picquart said: "When I asked General Gonse for permission to continue the investigation, insisting on the danger of allowing the Dreyfus family to proceed with their investigation alone, the General replied that it was impossible, in his opinion, and in the opinion of General de Boisdeffre and the Minister of War, to reopen the affair. When I pressed the point, in order to make General Gonse understand that nothing could prevent its reopening, if it could be believed that Dreyfus was innocent, General Gonse replied: 'If you say nothing nobody will know.'"

GONSE REBUKED BY PIQUART.

"General," I replied firmly, 'what you tell me is abominable. I do not know what I shall do. But I won't carry this secret with me.' This assertion caused a great stir in the courtroom."

"I at once left the room," added the witness. "That is what occurred. I know my account is disputed, but I positively swear it." He emphatically smote the bar in front of the witness box, and looked in the direction of the Generals.

The Colonel next described his intentions with regard to Esterhazy, which Generals Gonse and de Boisdeffre had forbidden him to carry out. He attached particular importance to this point, as it contained a clew to subsequent occurrences. Later the witness said that while Du Paty de Clam evidently acted wrongly in disguising himself with a false beard and blue spectacles, perhaps he was authorized to do so.

After a few minutes' suspension of the session Colonel Picquart resumed his deposition, showing how, through an article in the "Eclair" of September 15, he was satisfied that Esterhazy had been warned of the suspicions against him. In order to make the proof complete the witness continued his investigations with the utmost discretion. In his opinion, the only event of importance in the Dreyfus affair since the discovery of the dossier was the Henry forgery, perpetrated on October 31, 1896. It must have been handed immediately to General Gonse.

Just before Henry perpetrated the forged agent named Guenée, Henry's right hand man, prepared a report declaring that M. Castelin, Republican Revisionist, Deputy for the Laon Division of Alsace, was about to play the hand of the Dreyfus family by unmasking, in the Chamber of Deputies, the prisoner's accomplices, thus having the affair reopened.

PERSECUTION OF THE WITNESS.

Colonel Picquart incidentally complained bitterly, while he was still Chief of the Intelligence Department, that Henry's tool Guenée should be allowed to make reports against the witness, who had then established a connection between the reports of Guenée and the false deposition of Henry, who had testified that he had seen the witness seated in Maitre Lohol's office with the document containing the words "Cette canaille de D—" before them.

Each new scheme, said Colonel Picquart, was a complete development of the one preceding.

The next feature of Colonel Picquart's deposition was his recital of the intrigues against him and the pressure exercised by Henry, with the view of fixing on the witness the blame for communicating information to the newspapers. Then, turning to the distant mission upon which he was dispatched, Picquart described the irritation he felt when he saw that he was being removed because he was no longer wanted as head of the Intelligence Department. He explained that if this disgrace had been frankly avowed it would have been much less painful to him. The Colonel also said that during his absence his correspondence was tampered with.

Dealing with his mission to Tunis, which Colonel Picquart said ought to have been entrusted to a Commissary of Police, the witness declared that it was then that Henry, abandoning his underhand intrigues, began a campaign of open persecution. Henry wrote to the witness accusing him of communicating information to the press, with disclosing the contents of secret documents, and with attempting to suborn officers in connection with the petit bleu. It was then that Picquart learned of the existence of the forged secret documents directed against himself, and foresaw his own ruin if the Dreyfus affair was reopened, and to safeguard himself, he intrusted to a lawyer friend a certain letter from General Gonse, at the same time acquainting the lawyer with what he knew of Esterhazy, and instructing the lawyer how he should intervene, "if the occasion demanded it."

This lawyer, M. Lohol, communicated with M. Scheurer-Kestner, then one of the Vice-Presidents of the Senate, and the representations of the latter to Premier Méline's government followed.

PIQUART'S EXILE TO TUNIS.

When Picquart's furlough was due General Leclerc, commanding in Tunis, was ordered to send Picquart to the frontier of Tripoli. Leclerc commented to the witness on this abnormal order, and Picquart confided to the General the probable reasons for it, and his belief in the innocence of Dreyfus. General Leclerc thereupon ordered Picquart not to go beyond Gabes. In the mean while the campaign in Paris was continued. Esterhazy appeared among the witness's accusers. Picquart here created a sensation by incidentally remarking that the judges in 1894 were shamefully deceived in having the document containing the words "Cette canaille de D—" communicated to them. He bitterly recited the details of the various machinations, with the view of incriminating him, instigated by Henry, Esterhazy and Du Paty de Clam.

Colonel Jonaust, president of the court, having asked for explanations on certain points, Picquart said: "If I tell you all this, gentlemen, it is to show what must have been the mental attitude toward me of the members of the court martial which tried Esterhazy." (Murmurs of assent.)

When he resumed his deposition, the witness said he regretted he had not been given the opportunity to contradict his accusers at that court martial.

"I have almost finished my task," added Picquart; "but I ask permission to refer to the way the dossier came to the War Office. I have doubts in regard to the person who brought

Anglo-Saxon Review. Edited by Lady Randolph Churchill. Single copies \$2.00. Order from BRENTANO'S, Union Square, N. Y.

the dossier. Two quite different persons could certainly have delivered the dossier in 1894. But if an intelligent person had delivered it he would certainly have insisted on the value of its contents."

ROGET INTERROGATES PIQUART.

Generals Roget and Mercier having intimated a desire to speak, Colonel Jonaust asked Dreyfus if he had anything to say, and the prisoner replied in the negative.

General Roget then mounted the platform and asked Colonel Picquart for explanations regarding the Quenell affair.

"Colonel Picquart," said General Roget, "attacked me this morning in regard to my speech for the prosecution yesterday on the subject of the Quenell case. He said he was not present at the Ministry of War when the case was in progress, and he placed the responsibility on Colonel Henry. That is quite incorrect. I ask Colonel Picquart if he denies that he wrote Captain Marchal an order to connect him with Galanti, that he wrote to the Public Prosecutor, enclosing documents, and that he wrote to the Public Prosecutor a second time, July 15. If he denies this I ask the Court to send for Marchal and the dossier in the Quenell affair."

Colonel Picquart replied that there was no need to threaten to produce the dossier in order to make him reply. He added:

"I did not say I was absent during the Quenell affair. I said I was absent part of the time, and that painful duties did not permit me to participate in it as I would otherwise have done."

"Did you write those letters?" asked Colonel Jonaust.

"Yes," replied Picquart. "I remember writing letters in the case, though I do not remember exactly their terms or dates."

Colonel Jonaust then said: "General Roget asks if you deny you wrote a letter sending Galanti to Switzerland."

"Galanti," replied the witness, "was an agent who gave us information about the Italian forts in the neighborhood of Belfort. Finding ourselves on the point of being discovered, we naturally took measures to avoid it. That is why Galanti was sent to Switzerland."

"Then you wrote the letters," said General Roget, "and I add that Colonel Henry was not concerned in this affair. He was sent to Belfort against his will by Colonel Picquart."

The witness acknowledged writing some letters, but wanted to know their text. He said he would like to see them, so that he could be more precise.

"You must have seen," he said, "how much falsehood there has been in this affair."

In reply to further questions Picquart admitted sending documents to Belfort for the use of the Quenell case.

"But," Picquart added, "they were handed to the Public Prosecutor."

General Roget's questioning was evidently with the view of eliciting the confession from Colonel Picquart that in the Quenell case he communicated to the judges documents unknown to the defence, as he now accuses the General Staff of doing in the Dreyfus case. The General concluded with angrily repelling various statements of Picquart in regard to his connection with the press, and a dialogue apparently wholly unconnected with the present trial followed.

MERCIER MAKES DENIALS.

General Mercier promptly replaced General Roget. "Colonel Picquart," Mercier said, "has stated that I ordered him to convey documents to Colonel Maurel. That is false. I never handed any packet to Colonel Picquart for Colonel Maurel. I never mentioned secret documents to him."

In reply Colonel Picquart said: "I remember perfectly handing a packet to Colonel Maurel."

General Mercier next denied Colonel Picquart's statement relative to the meeting with General Gonse during the afternoon of January 6, 1895, when the latter was greatly excited at the prospect of war.

"That cannot be the case," said General Mercier. "General Gonse will make a deposition on the subject. I do not know what he will say. But he could not be apprehensive of war that afternoon, since I myself had no apprehensions on that score."

Colonel Picquart replied that he adhered to everything he had said. General Gonse, the witness explained, was excited because he knew of the action of an Ambassador toward M. Casimir-Perier, then President of the Republic. General Mercier next referred to Picquart's statement that the D'Avignon document was communicated to the court martial of 1894. He said:

"I deny it positively. The only documents communicated were the Panizzardi telegram, Du Paty de Clam's commentary, the note of the Italian attaché in regard to French railroads and the report of Guenée."

Picquart here pointed out that he had only expressed his belief on this subject.

General Mercier further thought it incumbent upon him to reply to the allegation of Colonel Picquart regarding the responsibility of Du Paty de Clam relative to the communication to a foreign Power of a note dealing with modifications in the artillery. This note is said to have been prepared in General Mercier's department.

"I declare," he said, "that inquiry has shown that the document was drawn up not by Du Paty de Clam, but by Colonel Masson in another department, though the record of it has disappeared."

In regard to the dossier General Mercier reaffirmed that it reached the Ministry through the ordinary channels.

Maitre Demange at